```
Fb5dngh
1
      UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
      SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK
 2
 3
     UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
                                              New York, N.Y.
                                              15 Cr. 0706(VSB)
 4
                 V.
5
     NG LAP SENG,
                    Defendant.
6
 7
           -----x
 8
                                              November 5, 2015
9
                                              3:05 p.m.
10
      Before:
11
                         HON. VERNON S. BRODERICK,
12
                                              District Judge
13
14
                                APPEARANCES
15
     PREET BHARARA
          United States Attorney for the
           Southern District of New York
16
     BY: JANIS ECHENBERG
17
           DANIEL C. RICHENTHAL
               Assistant United States Attorneys
18
      BRAFMAN & ASSOCIATES, P.C.
          Attorneys for Defendant
19
     BY: BENJAMIN BRAFMAN
20
          JACOB KAPLAN
21
               - also present -
22
      SA Ryan Carey, Federal Bureau of Investigation
23
      John Lau and Patsy Ong,
           Cantonese Language Interpreters
24
25
```

THE CLERK: In the matter of the United States of America versus Ng.

Counsel, please state your name for the record.

MS. ECHENBERG: Good afternoon, your Honor. Janice

Echenberg for the government. With me at counsel table is my

colleague Daniel Richenthal and Special Agent Ryan Carey of the

FBI.

THE COURT: Good afternoon.

MR. BRAFMAN: Good afternoon, your Honor. For the defendant, Mr. Ng, Benjamin Brafman and Jacob Kaplan from my firm. Good morning, sir -- good afternoon, sir.

THE COURT: Good afternoon.

Mr. Ng, can you hear and understand -- you may be seated. Can you hear and understand the interpreter?

THE DEFENDANT: I understand.

THE COURT: OK. Thank you.

OK. Let me review for the parties the materials I have in connection with today's bail conference. I have the --Mr. Brafman's letter of November 3rd. I have the government's response of November 4th. The government attached a copy of the October 22nd bail hearing we had. I have a copy of the bail order that I issued on the 23rd of October, a copy of the actual bond, as well as the order I issued yesterday to the parties.

Is there anything else that I should have? Yes?

MR. BRAFMAN: No, your Honor. I think you have everything. And if the Court permits, we might be able to shorten these proceedings if I were permitted to please begin by responding to the questions in the Court's order unless you prefer to proceed in a different way.

THE COURT: No. I was going to ask that the parties respond to those questions.

So, Mr. Brafman, if you would like to go first, go right ahead.

MR. BRAFMAN: Yes. Your Honor, I am going to do it in the order of your order to make it easier.

And just for the record, so that we don't confuse the interpreter, the person identified as Sun Yuan, Y-u-a-n, I think it's easier if we refer to her as Crystal, which is the name that she is known by, C-r-y-s-t-a-l. Jason, the name is Jason. And Ng Fei, F-e-i, Lan, L-a-n, who is the defendant's daughter, we can refer to her as Janet. I think it will make things easier for the reporter and all of us as well. Certainly me.

THE COURT: OK. Go ahead.

MR. BRAFMAN: Your Honor, with respect to the first question, the answer is no. None of the suretors were interviewed, to my knowledge, by anyone at the United States Attorney's office, because I think, as your Honor will recall and as I think the government will concede because my associate

had a conversation with at least one of the prosecutors today, the purpose of them signing as suretors, which came very late in the proceeding, was not because they were believed to be financially solvent to be able to secure a \$50 million bond but for the moral suasion, if you will, that having the defendant's family on the bond was an additional incentive for him not to flee. So none of them were interviewed by the United States Attorney's office. And, if interviewed, your Honor, they would, quite frankly, not be able to produce the kind of financial documentation that you might otherwise consider as an appropriate suretor in a case like this.

THE COURT: Sure. I mean, part of the rationale for me asking the question is that in addition to the questions that go directly to financial wherewithal, there are also questions related to employment and other things, which would have, I think, or could have — some of these issues may have come to light in part because of that.

MR. BRAFMAN: Well, let me make that part easier.

Because with question two, our original request was that Ms. -
Crystal be able to travel to China both for the medical

concerns addressing her son and also her mother and that she

also be permitted to work. We are prepared to withdraw the

request that she be permitted to work without at all conceding

the suggestion that her working at this company has anything

whatsoever to do with the defendant and the charges in this

case.

The company employs, to my knowledge, more than a thousand people. She works in the human resources position, and to my knowledge, your Honor, she has nothing to do with this case. But to make things easier for the Court and to ease the concern of the government, she is prepared not to go to the company and not to work there for any of the 40 days or 30 days, or whatever your Honor allows her, to go to Beijing — to China and then to Beijing, because with the status of her son, it becomes more difficult and she is really going primarily to address the medical issues in this case.

So we revise that request and it certainly makes it easier.

Your Honor, with respect to your question was either party aware that Jason had announced any job offer, let me answer as best I can and as candidly as I can. Mr. Mo, who is not here, who is the principal person who we have been using to debrief people, although Jason speaks in English, we were aware that he had a job opportunity in China. He has just graduated in May from the University of Southern California. His family lives in China. And he has been offered a position at a company that has nothing whatsoever to do with Mr. Ng.

Mr. Ng didn't get him the job. Mr. Ng didn't recommend him. And this is sort of like working for AIG. It is an enormous insurance trust company. He has an entry-level

position, but because he is bilingual and a college graduate from America he is an interesting commodity in China. They've offered him a fairly good job. And when he took the offer it was before Mr. Ng's arrest. He asked them to extend the starting date because he drives, he is a citizen, he knows his way around the city. He flew here because the family was with them. None of them really speak English besides Janet, but she has never driven in New York City.

So he came here. The job is waiting for him. He wants to take the job. It has nothing whatsoever to do with Mr. Ng's company. As your Honor will recall, because I reread the minutes of the hearing — and I reread the minutes of the hearing just to be careful that I not misspeak — I think at the end of the hearing, what happened was your Honor ultimately suggested or directed that whoever is going to live in the apartment surrender their travel documents so the defendant would not have access, obviously, to any travel documents. The Court said quite clearly at page 85 that if there were travel requirements, they could make an application to get them back. They are not charged with any offenses.

And Jason, in particular, is a son of a family friend. And you asked that relationship, and I will tell you -- I will go through the questions with respect to him. So we were aware that he had had a job offer. I did not know the extent of the commitment. I can't speak for Mr. Mo. I do know now that it

involves a company which I can identify for you, and it has absolutely nothing whatsoever to do with Mr. Ng. It's called Ping An -- P-i-n-g, An, A-n -- Insurance Group Company of China. As I understand it, it is an enormous company involving many, many thousands of employees. And Mr. Jason has an entry-level position, and he didn't get it at the request or at the referral of Mr. Ng. And Mr. Ng has no involvement in that company whatsoever.

Jason never worked at any time as Mr. Ng's personal assistant except since he's been in the apartment, he helps. He buys groceries. He does the things that people would normally do if they are not under house arrest. And he has been helping us, quite frankly, as an interpreter in communicating. And he's been very helpful, as I understand it, to the Guidepost people, who, when there is no interpreter, he and Janet help them in terms of their direction. But he was never employed by Mr. Ng or any of Mr. Ng's companies.

Your question six, how does --

THE COURT: Just so it's clear, why I asked that question is I believe that when -- and, if need be, we can get the Pretrial Services Officer on the phone rather than if there is something that comes up. My understanding, though, is that when the officer was visiting, I guess, I'm not sure if it was for a phone setup or some reason, that when he met Mr. Meng, I think he asked, you know, who are you, and I think the response

was I'm Mr. Ng's personal assistant.

MR. BRAFMAN: Yes. And since he has come to the United States after his arrest, that is a truthful, accurate statement.

THE COURT: OK.

MR. BRAFMAN: However, it is not in the same vein as Mr. Yin, the defendant, who worked for Mr. Ng as a personal assistant who is charged in the case.

And this is a cultural issue. He is an indentured servant, if you will, running errands for the family of a personal nature — cleaning, getting clothes for him, helping with the travel prior to his release, driving the children to the MDC because they have no way of knowing how to get there. So to that extent, he viewed himself at the time and I view him as a personal assistant. He also, quite frankly, has been my personal assistant because I can't interview Mr. Ng outside of Mr. Mo without either Janet or Jason. But he's not lying to Pretrial. It was his interpretation of what he saw as his role.

And in terms of did Mr. Ng know -- or how does Mr. Ng know Mr. Meng's parents, they have been friends for 30 years. They have real estate partnerships that they have invested in together. Jason's parents have nothing whatsoever to do with South-South News or the company that's in the heart of this case, that China has, you know, billions of people. And I know

the government seems to think that Mr. Ng controls China, there are many people there who are successful business people who he invests with who are just real estate people.

So he had met Mr. Ng's son many years ago. And the question that you have, is there any documentary evidence demonstrating that Mr. Meng is Mr. Ng's Godson, the answer is no. Let me again explain because this is a cultural not disconnect but a cultural statement.

THE COURT: Sure.

MR. BRAFMAN: Mr. Ng is very fond of Jason, as I think are all of us who have come to meet him and know him. He is bright. He is smart. He is a citizen. He is a college graduate. And he has a very good future. I'm referred to in conversations now by Mr. Ng and his family as the family uncle. I am not his uncle but that's how they refer to me.

"godson" is appropriate suggestion of how they view each other's relationship. Mr. Ng sees Jason as a brilliant young man and a very nice young man. The family and he get along, and he's the son of very dear friends. So he has been introduced to me as his godson. I have heard both of them use that term, but there is no church service or documentation or any clergy who has confirmed that fact.

So to the extent that we used the term, I used it correctly, but I want the Court to understand that it might be

different from how someone in the United States might make someone their godson either at a baptism or at a --

THE COURT: My question, again, didn't necessarily go to any religious significance. I do understand that that could be in part the reason why or the rationale for someone being a godfather or a godson.

What I was really trying to get to, I think, and they revolve around sort of what Mr. Meng, his employment situation was, whether or not he in fact was a friend of the family, godson or not, as opposed to someone who actually had been assisting Mr. Ng for more than just the time period he has been in the United States.

MR. BRAFMAN: I think what we're dealing with is he's known him for three years. The relationship is three years old, but he knows him as a son of a family friend. When this happened and he was arrested and remanded — and I ask your Honor to recognize that Mr. Ng is 68, has never been in trouble before, never been in jail — suddenly he was remanded in a place where he spoke no English. His two daughters — his daughter and his daughter—in—law left their children at home, flew to the United States, and were essentially lost, to be candid with you, in how to navigate them and deal with this process of remand. Mr. Ng was moved from the MCC, then to the MDC. I'm not faulting anyone.

And Jason took it upon himself -- he was in LA at the

time because he has family there as well, and he came to the United States and he put his job on hold. And to his credit, he helped them. He drove them to the MCC, then to the MDC. They were all living in that apartment.

So the suggestion of them wanting to live there because he's living there, that's the only place they lived since they came to the United States after his arrest. So that was the next question, I think, to answer your Honor's order of questions eight and nine. The daughter and the daughter-in-law came to the United States to help their father-in-law and came after his arrest and have lived in that apartment, because it's the only residence that the family owns. And they lived there prior to his being released, and they continue to reside there now to assist him.

So what I think has happened, Judge, is we have an issue that I'm sorry to burden the Court with, but we have a six-year-old son of Crystal who lives in Macau, and her mother was primarily in charge of taking the child to special treatment from China to -- from Macau to Beijing, where the specialists are. He has a severe renal failure problem that requires him to either go every month or every month, depending on the test results, for treatment. The treatment can last an hour or four days or a week depending on his being responsive. He's in the crisis period. And her mother has now deteriorated herself and can no longer do this.

And I think what your Honor will recall, we offered

Janet Ng, who is the defendant's daughter, as a suretor. She
speaks English. She has been living in the apartment. She was
the first person we mentioned. And then when we asked
permission for the other two people, who were not intended by
us to be suretors and we didn't offer them as suretors, we
asked permission for them to live in the apartment, what your
Honor then ruled -- and I think, quite frankly, correctly -- is
that they need to understand that when they live in the
apartment they have to be abiding by the same conditions as
everybody else -- no cell phones, they have to not have
visitors who aren't approved. And so that your Honor knows, so
far, this has been flawless. And I know the government refers
to one night when the defendant was late, and let me tell you,
sir --

THE COURT: That is OK. I've actually spoken to the Pretrial Services Officer.

MR. BRAFMAN: There was some confusion.

THE COURT: There was misunderstanding.

MR. BRAFMAN: And he was never out of custody of Guidepost. And I will also tell you one thing they don't remember but I remember because that was the night of the rainstorm several — at that night and traffic was just dead throughout the city. But he was not anywhere he wasn't supposed to be. He was coming from Mr. Mo's office downtown

back to the apartment. They had him there like 6:05.

Since then there have been no visitors to the apartment whatsoever except Mr. Mo, myself, Mr. Kaplan for legal issues. He has gone nowhere without approval of Pretrial. The only place he has gone is to Mr. Mo's office and on several occasions, with their approval, and to a doctor for a complete physical, because he has a deteriorating diabetic condition, with Pretrial permission.

And I'm authorized by the gentleman from Guidepost to represent to you, if you ask, that throughout the period of being in the apartment, the family has been very cooperative, very respectful, very easy to deal with, and has not done anything to raise any concern of those whatsoever.

So our request is as follows.

THE COURT: Mm-hmm.

MR. BRAFMAN: These people are not being asked to be removed as suretors. Both Crystal and Jason are prepared to remain as suretors. And to the extent that the moral suasion on the defendant is not to hurt his family if he were to violate the conditions of his bail, he would know that he is costing his daughter-in-law and Jason, who is a United States citizen, the liability of up to \$50 million, and that's the reason they were suggested as suretors as well.

Miss Crystal is asking permission to go to attend to her mother and to her son. The government I think initially

said they would consent to two weeks. It takes almost two days to get there and two days to get back and the treatment requires travel as well. And what they plan to do, just so the Court is aware, is, if given permission, they plan to return with their children, if he is healthy enough to travel, so that they could all spend the holiday period in New York with the children's grandfather. And assuming the child is well enough to travel, that's their present plan. If not, she'll come back without them and have to make other arrangements with family members to deal with the medical issues.

So I think this is more in the form of a humanitarian request from people who the record will reflect the Court only suggested that they be suretors because we wanted them to be able to live in the apartment. And to the extent that they now are suretors, they are not asking to be removed from the responsibility. As a practical matter, I know the government will say, Well, once they're in China, why would they come back? But the whole purpose of them being suretors was not to, you know, because they are financially responsible to meet the needs. The moral part is still, you know, heavy duty.

And at the end of the day, Judge, they -- the mother needs to go back -- the mother needs to go back, the child is sick, and I don't want this kid to lose a good job with a real future because he tried to be a good boy and help the family during the crisis.

And to the extent that we should have alerted your Honor to some of these issues before agreeing to them to be housed in the apartment, to be honest with you, they didn't manifest themselves until a couple of days ago when I wrote the letter. The child began to deteriorate. It's a very difficult situation for her to be so far apart. And she was willing to do that because when she came to the United States, she had no idea whether her father would ever be released, whether her father was going to be remanded forever. So, you know, she stepped up to the plate, got on a plane and came here to help him, to her credit and to Jason's credit, and now we're asking for them to be able to go back, consistent with your Honor's suggestion at the time of the hearing that if they needed to travel, they should come to court, which is what we're do.

THE COURT: OK. Thank you.

Let me sort of give a little bit of insight as to the rationale behind some of my questions.

Mistakenly, you know, when I heard they were living there, I probably assumed more in the domicile context than I should have, and by that I mean that they were in fact living there. In other words, they didn't — that it was more than just them coming here for the purpose of assisting Mr. Ng after his arrest. Obviously, I was incorrect in that assumption. In other words, I thought they were going to be residents of the apartment. That wouldn't have changed probably the actual

requiring them to be suretors, but I would have probably not asked all of the questions that I did.

But let me hear from the government.

MS. ECHENBERG: Thank you, your Honor.

So I don't think I need to take us back through the entire prior proceeding, but we obviously spent a lot of time on this defendant's bail conditions and they are significant. And at least to the government an important part of them was that three people who are close to the defendant were going to be suretors on his bond and were going to be here in the United States with him. Obviously, one of the things we argued heavily is that this defendant has no ties to the United States. And so we were reassured by the fact that your Honor had ordered that three of his close family members or family friends would both live with him, give up their travel documents, and sign the bond for moral suasion.

As you know, the defendant has been out for a single week, going on two weeks now, and has only traveled to and from his lawyer's office but is going to start to receive approved visitors soon. And so there is really no track record yet to be certain that he's going to be compliant, although he has essentially been compliant in the few days that he has been out. When we were told that basically two of the three cosigners wanted to leave the country and one of them didn't want to return, that changed the calculation for us

significantly.

But I think we can simplify what we're arguing about. The government does not want to stand in the way of a mother tending to her sick child and to her mother, and we had offered two weeks. We are willing to be flexible about that so that she can do what she needs to do to care for her family. What we cared strongly about was, first, that she not do any work on behalf of Mr. Ng when she is in Macau. It sounds like the defense has pulled off of that request and so we are happy about that. But we also don't want Miss Yuan and Mr. Meng gone at the same time. We don't want two-thirds of the suretors out of the country. Because whether or not they are saying they are willing to remain suretors, there is virtually no way for the government to enforce the bond on them if they are gone.

And so I think we can address Miss Yuan and we can figure out something that is reasonable for her travel if the government can be assured that Mr. Meng is not going to be allowed to leave the country until she returns without incident.

I would note with respect to her two things. That, one, is the government wants to clarify and, two, that I think it is important for your Honor to understand. Your Honor asked the first three questions were addressed to either party.

THE COURT: Yes.

MS. ECHENBERG: And the answer on behalf of the

government for number one and number three is no. We did not interview these individuals because they were purely for moral suasion, and we did not have any idea about this job offer until we were alerted by defense counsel. Obviously, it would have influenced the positions that we took at the bail hearing once your Honor had decided that these three individuals would be suretors.

With respect to number two, we do want to clarify the position that we took in our letter. And when we said in our letter that we were unaware that Ms. Yuan or Ms. Sun worked for Mr. Ng's company, we were speaking on behalf of myself and Mr. Richenthal. We followed up with our agents after your Honor asked this question, and we learned that there was a very brief interview of Ms. Sun at the time of the defendant's arrest so that they could return some items to the defendant. And she did mention that she worked for Mr. Ng. So we did as a collective entity know that prior to the bail hearing.

What we learned in doing some research online today is that it appears that Ms. Sun sits on the board of one of Mr. Ng's companies and is possibly an executive director of a real estate-related entity. So I'm not sure how that comports with her having a human resources job. That is at least some information that we found that was publicly available. So we continue to assert that she should not be allowed to do any work or go to the offices while she is there, and it sounds

like the defense is not asking for that.

With regard to Mr. Meng, or Jason, the equation becomes a little bit more complicated, because we've also been looking at him a little bit, you know, since he was proposed as a suretor. And what we found was that there are more than two dozen currency transaction reports involving him. There is a tremendous amount of cash that is moving among Australia, China and the United States.

Just to take one example, we saw a \$50,000 deposit into an account of his, a cash deposit. So if he is a recent college graduate who is unemployed, that seems inconsistent with the large amount of money. There are currency transaction reports and other reports we see that reflect total deposits into one California account that he is associated with more than \$2 million.

THE COURT: I'm sorry. Just back up. The total deposits?

MS. ECHENBERG: Into A single California bank account that he is associated with of more than \$2 million.

THE COURT: And when you say "associated with," what do you mean?

MS. ECHENBERG: It is his personal account, your Honor.

THE COURT: OK. Is the \$2 million in the account now, do you know?

MS. ECHENBERG: I don't know. This is a report that is recent, but I cannot say standing here today that that money is in that account right now.

THE COURT: OK.

MS. ECHENBERG: We can certainly endeavor to find out.

And so because of all of this money moving in and out of his accounts, because he seems to, at least to our knowledge, very recently have this job in China, we're concerned about what he might do when he goes there and whether or not — I mean, he doesn't intend to come back. So the fact is that if he leaves, we are essentially down to two cosigners rather than three. We have concerns about what he might do when he leaves, but we also have concerns about being left with two suretors rather than three.

And I would note that the three visitors to the apartment that the government has now approved were presented to us as family friends. So the defendant has family friends who live in New York City, although they I believe asserted at the original bail hearing that there was no one else who could possibly sign this bond. There are at least three people who intend to visit the apartment who have been presented to us as family friends and who we vetted. One of them was described by Mr. Ng's daughter during this brief interview that I mentioned as an uncle. Again, that may just be a term of endearment.

But, again, there are other people who could replace Mr. Meng

if your Honor is inclined to essentially release him from the bond.

THE COURT: OK. All right.

MR. BRAFMAN: Can I just say something?

THE COURT: Sure.

MR. BRAFMAN: Briefly.

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. BRAFMAN: First of all, there is no suggestion, nor is there any evidence, Mr. Jason Ng -- we said this at the bail hearing, I believe --

THE COURT: Mr. Meng.

MR. BRAFMAN: I'm sorry. Jason. We said this at the bail hearing, that his family has assets but he doesn't.

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. BRAFMAN: His family is very wealthy. And when you fill out a Currency Transaction Report in the United States, you are not trying to hide the money. And not all cash transactions suggest illegality. They are buying a lot of real estate. Whether they comply with tax laws or not has nothing to do with this matter.

THE COURT: Mr. Brafman, I wasn't taking it as illegality. I recognize that in light of your comment that his family is involved in real estate, that it may not be a hundred percent sort of his money, in a sense, or he may have some interest in it. I don't know.

I apologize. I interrupted you. Go ahead.

MR. BRAFMAN: I'm just saying the suggestion that they have no problem with his daughter-in-law going but they want to keep him from going, he had this job offer before Mr. Ng was arrested. He has put it on hold to help Mr. Ng. It wasn't intended for him to sacrifice his career over it and to have him stay here until she returns because that suggests to them that there's more reason for Mr. Ng to stay. The overwhelming consideration that one gets from reading the hearing minutes, your Honor, is that the defendant is on electronic bracelet, locked in an apartment with two armed guards full-time 24/7 barring the only door in and out of the apartment. And to that extent, whether Jason is there or not, he can't leave and he hasn't tried to leave.

We have recently submitted several people who we have vetted. They have wanted to visit Mr. Ng. And in compliance with the Court's directive, we gave the names and addresses, telephone numbers, Social Security numbers to the government to vet. They had vetted them. I have not met any of these people myself.

THE COURT: OK.

MR. BRAFMAN: And I have never discussed with them whether they would or would not agree to be a suretor.

THE COURT: OK. This is my thought on it and it's going to require probably some work by the parties and some

thought. You know, look, I understand that Mr. Ng's daughter-in-law came here, and, as I mentioned, I had thought she was living here. So I was surprised that she was living here because she had children in China, and that was something that in fact I actually discussed with my chambers but I took it for what it was. But having said that, obviously -- and the government doesn't object that she be able to go back to tend to whatever health needs of her family -- with regard to Mr. Meng, what I would like, Mr. Brafman, for you to do is to determine whether or not any of the three individuals who are friends, whether or not they would be willing to sign the bond.

Mr. Meng is not going to come back. I'm not inclined to take actions that would lead him to lose this job. However, I would like, if there is — if he has some documentation of the job, I would like to see that, in other words, whether it is a job offer or whatever, I don't know what it might be. But what I'm looking to do is to have another cosigner. Mr. Meng can remain on the bond but it would be someone else who is here.

Because, obviously, yes, he was obviously signed because of, you know, moral suasion, but, you know, to the point that you raised, if someone is in another country and outside the reach of the government, outside the reach of the government in connection with any of their finances, although I understand there currently is an account here, there would be

less -- there is less of an impact on an individual, and so what I am looking for is to get another cosigner to sign the bond.

MR. BRAFMAN: OK. Can we do this, Judge, only because of the crisis involving the child? There doesn't seem to be any -- I will explain and prevail on Jason to remain here until there is a suretor who is substituted who is satisfactory to the government. We will try and do that as expeditiously as possible. I will try and get whatever documentation we can in the event we are not able to substitute him as a suretor.

But Miss Crystal has tried her best to deal with the situation long distance and it is falling apart. So if the Court is inclined to allow her to travel, then she would like to leave as quickly as possible and be able to get her documents back from Pretrial even today, if your Honor permits, because it's a long trip and the kid needs to get to Beijing and she needs to get him there, and her mother is in failing health as well. So I am prepared to accept what I can get today, and I appreciate your Honor's concern and patience. But since the government doesn't seem to object to her travel, the question is only how long she gets to be there.

And what we'd like to ask is that she be permitted to leave tonight, if possible, or tomorrow, as soon as she gets her travel documents, with the understanding that she would come back on or before December 19th, because that will allow

her to bring the children back, who will then be on school holiday. She has a 10-year-old daughter as well. Bring her children back. She is also going to bring back Janet's children, who will remain here throughout, but she wants to be with the children for the holiday, and then surrender her travel documents again when she comes back and arrange for someone else to take the children back to China.

THE COURT: OK.

MR. BRAFMAN: So if she can leave as early as today or tomorrow, get her documents as soon as your Honor notifies

Pretrial that she can obtain them, we will delay the travel of

Jason until we have a substitute suretor who is satisfactory to

your Honor hopefully in the next day or two.

THE COURT: OK. All right. Let me -- I just have a quick -- because I did request, just so the parties know, from Pretrial to get copies of the passports of the cosigners. And I don't pretend to know what visas, but does Mr. Meng have a work visa as opposed to --

MR. BRAFMAN: He is a United States citizen.

THE COURT: No. Work visa for China?

MR. BRAFMAN: Can he answer you, your Honor, himself?

THE COURT: Sure. You may need to come up a little so that the court reporter can hear you.

MR. MENG: No. I don't have a work visa now, but I would like to apply for a work visa once I go to the job

```
because I need to talk to the human resource people. I need like a document and I can apply for a work visa. I have a 10-year visa now.
```

THE COURT: Yes. I noticed that you have a Q2 visa, which I understand --

MR. MENG: So I need to exit the country every three months or every four months.

THE COURT: 120 days, yes. OK.

MR. MENG: Thank you, Judge.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you.

So let me hear from the government with regard to -- I mean, I would lean towards allowing -- well, we're going to -- I'm going to allow --

MR. BRAFMAN: Crystal.

THE COURT: -- Crystal, Ms. Sun Yuan, to go back. I don't know whether -- does she have airline tickets now?

MR. BRAFMAN: We have as a precaution not booked them and paid for them but she has a reservation for tonight, subject to your Honor's approval. So we did that only because these are not easy tickets to book and it is a very long trip. But, obviously, they are not paid for but will be if your Honor gives her permission.

THE COURT: And when she returns, where are all of these people going to stay?

MR. BRAFMAN: Well, the children, if she brings back

the children, they are going to stay a hotel nearby. There are several hotels less than two blocks from the apartment, and Mr. Ng will remain in the apartment. And to the extent that your Honor requires the people to stay there, I don't know what the purpose —

THE COURT: No. I mean, for the additional cosigners and, actually, if we can see -- however many are willing to sign, I would like to sign. So at least one but, you know, two would be better. They do not need to stay in the apartment.

MR. BRAFMAN: Those people have their own residences I have since learned.

THE COURT: Just to be clear, it wasn't necessarily -- I wasn't thinking it would be a requirement that people live there.

MR. BRAFMAN: I understand.

THE COURT: But since they were living there, it was something that I thought we needed to take certain steps.

OK. Let me hear from the government, and I want to in part hear about the working for the company. I mean, as I understand it, Ms. Yuan is not going to work for the company when she is back in China. I want to get a sense of what the government's position about her working, if that isn't -- I mean my understanding is the parties agree, although they may not agree as to exactly what her responsibilities are but they agree that that is a job that she has.

MR. BRAFMAN: Yes. But, Judge, if I may? Since she is not going to work for the company during the period that she is there and that is a specific direction, I would like to submit in writing exactly what she -- this is a massive company, and to the extent that your father owns companies -- and it is plural, "companies" and most of them have nothing to do with this case -- it is quite common for family members to have, you know, jobs. She is a bright woman. She is a talented woman. Her husband works for one of the companies. So I'd like to get this information correctly. Mr. Mo is not here. He is the primary interpreter. I would like to submit something in writing. The government can then respond rather than me winging it.

THE COURT: How about -- no one should wing it. But how about this? You have a conversation with them and see if you can come to some sort of agreement before you involve me.

MR. BRAFMAN: That is fine.

THE COURT: You know, I don't know what the nature of her job is. I don't know what the nature of it is and whether she would be able to do it whether here or in China, but that's something I think the parties need to be -- and I don't know the exact nature of the government's concern, and to the extent they have concern, you may be able to alleviate that concern.

MR. BRAFMAN: Very good.

THE COURT: I just don't know.

MR. BRAFMAN: We will get the information, meet and talk with the government, and if we can't come to an understanding, we will involve your Honor, if necessary. And in the interim during her trip, which hopefully begins tonight if she can get her documents back from Pretrial, she understands completely that she is not to go to the office, she is not working there, and that trip is to help her family.

THE COURT: Yes. OK.

Let me hear from the government.

MS. ECHENBERG: Your Honor, I think we're fine with what's being contemplated right now. And given that the child apparently has a school holiday on December 19th, we are sympathetic to that. We didn't know that fact previously. So we have no problem with that.

We would ask your Honor just to explicitly order, because I believe Crystal is in the courtroom --

MR. BRAFMAN: She is.

MS. ECHENBERG: -- so we would ask that you explicitly order her on the record that she is not to go to the offices, any of the offices, she is not to engage in any work related to any of Mr. Ng's companies while she is there.

I agree with Mr. Brafman that we should take some time to understand exactly what her role is and whether it raises further concerns for us. We learned almost as we were walking to court today about her role on the board and being an

executive director of the company. So, we want to look into that more. We are certainly interested to hear what

Mr. Brafman has to say about that, and we can hopefully make a joint proposal to your Honor about how to proceed.

THE COURT: OK. I think I am going to need -- could I prevail on the interpreters to help me in this regard? Well -- MR. BRAFMAN: She doesn't speak English.

THE COURT: Could you come forward. This is Crystal. It is Sun Yuan or Crystal Yuan, Y-u-a-n.

Miss Yuan, I understand that you have agreed not to work when you return to your homeland. So let me just be clear as to what the parameters of that will be. OK?

So I'm ordering that you not work in any of the offices of the businesses that you work for, that you not engage in any work while you are there either over the phone, electronically, or in any means. And obviously, you know, I'm sorry about the health issues with your family members, but you should spend your time — and this is not an order — but you should spend your time dealing with their health issues. And we expect you back on or before December 19th.

OK?

MS. SUN: OK.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you.

MR. BRAFMAN: Thank you, Judge.

Your Honor, is she able to go to Pretrial, and is she

going to need something from you to get it or Ms. Williams to get the travel documents?

THE COURT: She may. We may need to do an order, but we can do that fairly quickly, I think.

MR. BRAFMAN: Thank you very much.

THE COURT: I don't know what the whole process is. I know that they are secured I think in a safe. So I'm not sure -- so I'm hopeful that you will be able to get it today but I can't promise that.

MR. BRAFMAN: If she gets there now -- I've done this before. If she gets there now and they get something from the Court, they'll get it to her, and my associate Jacob will go with her to make sure that she knows where she is going and how to get back.

THE COURT: You may want to -- just in case, because I think if there is anything else we need to deal with, why don't they start heading over there now.

MR. BRAFMAN: They are.

THE COURT: OK. Wait. Let me hear from the government. Ms. Echenberg, do you want to say something? Did I miss something that you wanted me to cover with you?

MR. RICHENTHAL: Could we have one moment to confer?

I'm sorry, your Honor.

THE COURT: OK.

(Pause)

MS. ECHENBERG: So one point clarifying with regard to this individual, we don't want her even visiting the offices, physically going to them at all. I think that was clear in what you ordered.

MR. BRAFMAN: I think it is clear in the order. She has no interest in visiting them. I will revisit the issue when she comes back as to whether or not she should be able to continue working for the company once we know exactly more — much more information to give your Honor and the government.

THE COURT: OK. This is what I would suggest. It's fine to communicate -- look, I don't want there to be any misunderstanding where she goes to visit friends there and all of a sudden, you know, there is some application when she gets back.

MR. BRAFMAN: Right.

THE COURT: So I just think it needs to be clear. I don't need to necessarily order it, Mr. Brafman, but we have the interpreter here. If you could communicate that to her, that that includes visiting any of the places of work.

The other thing I would ask you to do is during the interim not wait until she returns on the 19th but engage in a conversation with the government between now and then.

Obviously, you may need to speak with her to get details, but engage -- start the conversation because --

MR. BRAFMAN: We will.

THE COURT: -- you know, because if she comes back on the 19th, in reality, we're probably not dealing with this until, you know, after the holidays, and it might be better if you have a sense of what the issues are.

MR. BRAFMAN: Your Honor, we would have more information available to you today, but we were trying to divide some of the work. Mr. Mo is giving a speech out of town today. He was spending a substantial amount of time trying to develop this information, and sometimes I'm an exhibit in the room when he is doing that because it is in Mandarin and it is hard for me to pick up. But I will --

THE COURT: Are you Exhibit A? Exhibit 1? The defense usually goes with letters.

MR. BRAFMAN: I hope I'm Exhibit A, Judge, but it don't matter at that point.

Your Honor, I will get you the information well before the 19th or get it to the government.

THE COURT: And I am around. So if there are any issues with regard to the potential other suretors, the individuals who are now on the visitor list, just let me know. I'm confident that the parties will be able to work through that.

MR. BRAFMAN: I think so. Thank you very much.

THE COURT: Yes?

MS. ECHENBERG: So we have one comment about the

additional cosigners.

2 THE COURT: Yes.

MS. ECHENBERG: First, we would very much like your Honor to order that there be two additional cosigners.

THE COURT: I will order two.

MS. ECHENBERG: And, also, we want to interview those cosigners and evaluate whether they are financially responsible.

THE COURT: Let me just -- that's fine, you could interview the cosigners. I think I mentioned at the October 22nd that I was fine with interviewing the cosigners.

My view is you interview all cosigners whether or not you believe them to be financially responsible because sometimes it is helpful. It is also helpful, I think, in emphasizing what the nature of signing a bond is. Even though I know it happens across the street, I think people need to understand the implications of that, because, you know, as parties have pointed out, you know, in connection with another case I have, I had the application to revoke somebody's bond and that's put family members on the hook for a substantial amount of money.

So is there anything else that we need to do?

MR. BRAFMAN: May Mr. Kaplan leave --

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. KAPLAN: Thank you, Judge.

```
1
               THE COURT: Could I just ask if you could just
      communicate that no visiting.
 2
 3
               MR. BRAFMAN: Yes.
 4
               (Pause)
 5
               She understands, your Honor.
 6
               THE COURT: OK. Thank you.
 7
               OK. Is there anything else that we need to do?
               MR. BRAFMAN: I don't believe so, sir.
 8
9
               MS. ECHENBERG: Not from the government, no.
10
               THE COURT: OK. All right. So, Mr. Brafman, we'll
11
      start taking care of putting together whatever paperwork we
12
      need in order for the passport to be released.
13
               MR. BRAFMAN: I appreciate your attention to this,
14
      Judge. Thank you very much.
15
               THE COURT: All right.
               MS. ECHENBERG: Your Honor, this relates to a
16
17
     different defendant and this may have come over email already
18
     but I haven't seen --
               THE CLERK: It is done.
19
20
               MS. ECHENBERG: It is done for Mr. Yan?
21
               THE CLERK: Yes.
22
               THE COURT: OK. I signed the bond.
23
               MS. ECHENBERG: Yes, your Honor.
24
               THE COURT: OK. Thank you very much.
25
```